

11/023/004



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Fishlake
National
Forest

115 East 900 North
Richfield, Utah 84701
801 896-9233

File Code: 1950/2720

Date: January 20, 1995

1134

Dear Forest User:

I am enclosing a copy of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Ash Grove Cement Mine Plan Amendment on the Fillmore Ranger District, Fishlake National Forest for your review and comments. Three alternatives were considered and analyzed in the EA and I have identified Alternative B as my preferred Alternative. Alternative B includes the addition of 271 acres to the mining area. One hundred and forty-five acres will be on National Forest. About 65 acres will be in the expanded mine and 80 acres will be used for access roads and overburden waste disposal.

Although a preferred Alternative has been identified, my final decision on which alternative to implement has not been made. You can help me in making this decision by providing written review comments on the EA. Your comments regarding the EA should be mailed to me at the following address: Forest Supervisor, Fishlake National Forest, 115 East 900 North, Richfield, UT 84701.

Comments must be postmarked or received within 30 days beginning the day following publication of this notice in the Richfield Reaper. Your comments need to be as specific as possible and contain the following:

- (1) Name, address, and (if possible) telephone number;
- (2) Title of the document(s) on which comment is being submitted; and
- (3) Specific facts or comments along with supporting reasons that the person believes the Responsible Official should consider in reaching a decision.

If you have questions regarding this proposal, please contact Bill Wright, Interdisciplinary Team Leader at (801)743-5721.

Sincerely,

for TOBIAS A. MARTINEZ
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure



Caring for the Land and Serving People

FS-6200-28 (7-82)

670, Rawlins, Wyoming 83301, phone 307-324-7711.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement analyzes the project development alternatives and the no action alternative. The proposed project provides a maximum development of 750 wells and 300 locations within the GWA II analysis area, in addition to existing operations. The proposed project would affect 2,416 acres, bringing the total disturbance area within the GWA II area to 14,943 acres of land.

Dated: January 12, 1995.

Gordon Schaffer,
Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 95-1390 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-P

[UT-920-05-1330-00]

Public Review Period of Proposed Classification Standards for Establishing Known Leasing Areas for Gilsonite

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Interior, through Secretarial Orders 3071 and 3087 transferred the authority under 43 USC 21 to classify public lands for leasable minerals to the Director, Bureau of Land Management. On May 22, 1986, regulations were finalized at 43 CFR part 3500 which provided for prospecting permits for gilsonite on lands that were not known to contain valuable deposits of gilsonite. Lands with known gilsonite deposits will be subject to competitive leasing procedures only. The Utah State Office, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is requesting the public to review the following proposed standard which would be used to determine whether lands will be subject to competitive leasing for gilsonite. Lands will be defined as a Known Gilsonite Area and subject to competitive leasing if they contain a gilsonite vein that can be mapped as a continuous vein based on surface exposures or other indications of a continuous linear feature. The Known Gilsonite Leasing Area shall be described by aliquot parts generally no smaller than a quarter-quarter section or when appropriate a lot. If any part of the lot or quarter-quarter section contains a portion of a mapped vein meeting the classification standard, that subdivision shall be included within the Known Gilsonite Leasing Area.

Information requested from the public via this notice may be in the form of a letter and should be as specific as possible. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be accepted

for a period of 60 days from the date of this Federal Register notice, and should be addressed to: Mat Millenbach, State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Kohler, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, Division of Mineral Resources, P. O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0155, (801) 539-4037.

Douglas M. Koza,

Deputy State Director, Mineral Resources.

[FR Doc. 95-1521 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P

[WY-920-41-5700; WYW121262]

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease

January 10, 1995.

Pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 188 (d) and (e), and 43 CFR 3108.2-3 (a) and (b)(1), a petition for reinstatement of oil and gas lease WYW121262 for lands in Campbell County, Wyoming, was timely filed and was accompanied by all the required rentals accruing from the date of termination. The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of \$10.00 per acre, or fraction thereof, per year and 16 2/3 percent, respectively.

The lessee has paid the required \$500 administrative fee and \$125 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in section 31 (d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW121262 effective September 1, 1994, subject to the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above.

Pamela J. Lewis,

Supervisory Land Law Examiner.

[FR Doc. 95-1385 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-22-M

[WY-920-41-5700; WYW115954]

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease

January 10, 1995.

Pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 188 (d) and (e), and 43 CFR 3108.2-3 (a) and (b)(1), a petition for reinstatement of oil and gas lease WYW115954 for lands in Lincoln

County, Wyoming, was timely filed and was accompanied by all the required rentals accruing from the date of termination.

The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of \$10.00 per acre, or fraction thereof, per year and 16 2/3 percent, respectively.

The lessee has paid the required \$500 administrative fee and \$125 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in Section 31 (d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW115954 effective June 1, 1994, subject to the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above.

Pamela J. Lewis,

Supervisory Land Law Examiner.

[FR Doc. 95-1384 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-22-M

[WY-920-41-5700; WYW115958]

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease

January 10, 1995.

Pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 188 (d) and (e), and 43 CFR 3108.2-3 (a) and (b)(1), a petition for reinstatement of oil and gas lease WYW115958 for lands in Lincoln County, Wyoming, was timely filed and was accompanied by all the required rentals accruing from the date of termination.

The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of \$10.00 per acre, or fraction thereof, per year and 16 2/3 percent, respectively.

The lessee has paid the required \$500 administrative fee and \$125 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in section 31 (d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW115958 effective June 1, 1994, subject to the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above.

Pamela J. Lewis,

Supervisory Land Law Examiner.

[FR Doc. 95-1383 Filed 1-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-22-M

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ASHGROVE CEMENT MINING PLAN MODIFICATION**

U.S.D.A. Forest Service
Fillmore Ranger District
Fishlake National Forest
Juab and Millard Counties, Utah

34

I. Purpose and Need for Action

The Ashgrove Cement Company, located 23 miles southwest of Nephi, Utah, on State Highway 132, proposes to modify their existing mining plan by increasing the disturbed area from 291 acres to 510 acres. Of the 271 acres of new disturbance, 145 acres will be on National Forest. About 65 acres will be for the expansion of the pit as it follows its ore body along their mining claims. The remaining 80 acres will be used for access roads and overburden waste disposal areas.

The original mine plan was submitted in 1979 by the previous owner, Martin Marietta. NEPA documents were completed and signed by the Forest Supervisor on February 14, 1980. This document is an extension of the original NEPA and will confine its scope to the proposed mining plan amendment.

II. Issues and Concerns

Scoping was done by placing a legal notice in the Richfield Reaper, the Juab Times-News and the Millard County Chronicle-Progress. A scoping letter was also sent to the Fishlake list of interested parties wanting to be involved in environmental documents.

The issues and concerns identified during the scoping process are:

1. Disturbed lands should be seeded with plant species suitable for wildlife.
2. Should the Forest Service provide areas for disposal of overburden waste when the cement company owns nearby land?

III. Alternatives Considered

- A. No Action. Do not approve the proposed mining plan modification. Under the 1872 mining law and current regulations the proponent could continue to mine as long as the procedures used are reasonable. It would be irresponsible for the forest Service to not cooperate in developing a mining plan; therefore, this alternative will not be considered further.
- B. Expand the area of operations to 510 acres with 145 acres being on National Forest as proposed.
- C. Modify the mining plan to allow the mine to continue to grow on National Forest but overburden waste will need to be stored on private land.

IV. Consequences of Alternatives

Alternative B - Expand the area of operations to 510 acres with 145 acres being on National Forest as proposed. The effects of this proposal are basically of two types. Those associated with the quarry and those associated with the overburden disposal areas.

In the quarry all natural features will be removed. The vegetation and overburden will be removed and stored in selected disposal areas. The limestone ore will be removed and used in the manufacture of cement. The quarry will be reclaimed as stated in the original mining plan by stair stepping levels from the top of the quarry down to the bottom of the quarry.

There are two overburden disposal areas. The northwest site will be used but not extensively. The site would increase by 2 to 5 acres. The lower end of this disposal area will be seen from State Highway 132 but is overshadowed by the massive mine operation. Reclamation will be done as stated in the original mine plan for this disposal area. The overburden will be transported to waste areas by truck and/or conveyor belts.

All impacts to this area are similar to those addressed in the original Environmental Assessment except the southwest survey marker for Section 33 may be buried. This is easily remedied by offsetting the corner and replacing it after the site is reclaimed.

The majority of the roads constructed will later be destroyed as the quarry expands. A few roads will be outside of the final quarry and will need to be reclaimed by contouring and revegetating as they are no longer needed.

The proposed southeast overburden disposal area would cover about 50 acres and would fill in a small canyon located in the NE 1/4 of Section 4. The canyon is deeply cut into a conglomerate formation that is adjacent to the limestone ore body. The area is sparsely vegetated with juniper, sagebrush, forbes and grasses.

Ashgrove would like to haul overburden material to the north rim of the canyon and deposit it into the canyon.

Runoff from snow melt and thunderstorms from this canyon is caught in several collection ponds. This prevents silt from reaching the Sevier River, which is 1 3/4 miles to the north.

A French drain will need to be constructed in the bottom of the canyon to allow any runoff to pass under the overburden disposal area and not create an impoundment.

Reclamation will be the same as for other overburden disposal areas covered in the original mine plan.

Alternative C - Under this alternative the mining and rehabilitation of the quarry would progress as in Alternative B. The overburden material would be transported to private land for disposal.

Most roads would be obliterated as the quarry progresses. Some roads accessing overburden disposal areas, and mining access outside of the quarry would need to be obliterated and revegetated when no longer needed for access. All reclamation would be done in accordance with the guidelines established in the original mining plan and current standards when the reclamation takes place.

Under this alternative 50 acres of National Forest Land would not be impacted by the mining operation. Lands used to store the overburden materials would be in full view of State Highway 132 and would cover about 100 acres because the land is flatter than the proposed National Forest sites.

To transport the overburden, Ashgrove proposes to construct a 1,350-foot conveyor belt at a cost of 1.5 million dollars. A similar system to transport the overburden to private land would be 6,400 feet long and cost 12.5 million dollars, plus operating costs would be about ten times greater each year. Ashgrove does not want to put overburden material back into the quarry because it would be placing it on top of ore grade limestone that they hope to mine in the future and would require the overburden to be moved again.

The State of Utah requires the mine area to be zero water discharge area to protect the Sevier River from any pollutants from the mining and milling areas.

For overburden soil to be placed on private land, several ponds would need to be constructed to catch all water drainage from the area. This would impart about 25 to 30 acres and cost about \$600,000.

Alternatives A, B, or C would not have any effects on flood plains or wetlands. The area has been surveyed for archaeological values and no significant values would be effected.

A Biological Evaluation and a Biological Assessment are available for review at the Fillmore Ranger District office. Their conclusion was no effect on threatened, endangered or sensitive species.

V. Consultations

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee

VI. Interdisciplinary Team

Bill Wright - Forester
Lynn Findlay - Geologist
Del Barnhurst - Range Conservationist
Dana Nall - Wildlife Biologist

